

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA  
CLARKSBURG**

**NANCY JANE STAMPER,**

**Petitioner,**

**v.**

**Civ. Action No. 1:20-CV-200  
(Kleeh)**

**WARDEN P. ADAMS,**

**Respondent.**

---

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION [ECF NO. 5]**

---

On August 13, 2020, the pro se Petitioner, Nancy Jane Stamper ("Petitioner"), filed a Petition for Habeas Corpus Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 and the local rules, the Court referred the action to United States Magistrate Judge Michael J. Aloi for initial review. On August 18, 2020, the Magistrate Judge entered a Report and Recommendation ("R&R"), recommending that the Court dismiss the Petition without prejudice.

The R&R also informed the parties that they had fourteen (14) days from the date of service of the R&R to file "specific written objections, identifying the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objection is made, and the basis of such objection." It further warned them that the "[f]ailure to file written objections . . . shall constitute a waiver of de novo review by the District Court and a waiver of appellate review by

**STAMPER V. ADAMS****1:20-CV-200****ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION [ECF NO. 5]**

---

the Circuit Court of Appeals." The docket reflects that Petitioner accepted service of the R&R on August 21, 2020. See ECF No. 8. To date, no objections have been filed.

When reviewing a magistrate judge's R&R, the Court must review de novo only the portions to which an objection has been timely made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). Otherwise, "the Court may adopt, without explanation, any of the magistrate judge's recommendations" to which there are no objections. Dellarcirprete v. Gutierrez, 479 F. Supp. 2d 600, 603-04 (N.D.W. Va. 2007) (citing Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983)). Courts will uphold portions of a recommendation to which no objection has been made unless they are clearly erroneous. See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

Because no party has objected, the Court is under no obligation to conduct a de novo review. Accordingly, the Court reviewed the R&R for clear error. Upon careful review, and finding no clear error, the Court **ADOPTS** the R&R [ECF No. 5]. The petition is **DENIED** and **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**. Petitioner's pending motion to proceed as a pauper [ECF No. 2] is **DENIED AS MOOT**. The Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to send Petitioner a Court-approved form Bivens packet, should Petitioner wish to proceed with her claims in a civil rights action. The Court further **ORDERS** that this matter be **STRICKEN** from the Court's active docket and **DIRECTS**

STAMPER V. ADAMS

1:20-CV-200

---

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION [ECF NO. 5]**

---

the Clerk to enter a separate judgment order.

It is so **ORDERED**.

The Clerk is directed to transmit copies of this Order to the pro se Petitioner via certified mail, return receipt requested.

DATED: September 10, 2020

*Tom S Klee*

---

THOMAS S. KLEEH  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE